

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 10-15 and 24-29 are allowed and that claims 6, 8, 21, 23, 35 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been objected to due to a typographical error. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the typographical error.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 16-20, 22, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fadem et al. in view of Young et al. in further view of Wasilewski et al. This is a new ground of rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 16 and 30 are in condition for allowance since the claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references. This is also admitted in the office action itself. For example, the office action alleges that Fadem teaches “preventing interception of the incoming data by providing insertion data for insertion as part of the incoming data (see column 12, lines 33-52...)”. However, the same paragraph also admits “However Fadem et al. does not disclose providing insertion data in order to prevent interception of the incoming data.” The Fadem reference cannot be cited as both teaching and not teaching the same subject matter. Since it is admitted that the Fadem reference does not teach or disclose providing insertion data in order to prevent interception of the incoming data, it cannot be used to reject the first limitation of claim 1 and other claims, for example. For this reason alone, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Moreover, the claims require that the insertion data is not actual data and as Applicant previously noted, Fadem teaches only the use of actual data which is used by the system. For example, the link flow control bits in the Fadem reference are actual data and not insertion

data, as actual data is data that is used by the system. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance as the cited references do not teach or suggest the combination of the limitations.

Applicant has also added new dependent claims which are believed to be allowable since none of the references alone or in combination appear to teach preventing interception of incoming data by providing fake data (e.g. random data) for insertion as part of the incoming data and filtering received incoming data containing actual data and fake data by comparing the stored provided insertion data with incoming data to determine which data is actual data. Other differences will be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/13/05

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005